

WASHINGTON.

The Fish Basis of Settlement for the Alabama Claims.

President Grant Hanging to the Con-
sequential Damages.

FREE DEFICIENCY BILL AMENDMENTS.

Dr. Howard's Case, Aff. and Al.

Day in the House.

CRESWELL'S CRUSADE AGAINST COLFAX.

WASHINGTON, April 25, 1872.

Secretary Fish's Plan for Settlement of the Treaty Question—The President's Views—The Direct Damage Lobby's Arguments.

The immediate basis of settlement of the troubles in regard to consequential damages, which it is understood is now under consideration on both sides of the Atlantic, attract a good deal of attention here, and is generally laughed at by the democrats as puerile. It will fail to give satisfaction to a strong minority, which is ready upon every opportunity to arraign the foreign policy of the administration, and it is known, besides, that this panacea of the Secretary of State is far from proving acceptable to the President. If

consents to it it will be only in the interests of peace. He still clings to his original opinion, that the question of consequential damages is a question to be determined only by the arbitrators at Geneva, and, while no award is expected, he thinks this government ought to insist upon the question being disposed of by the only tribunal which is competent to settle it.

It is urged by the adherents of the Secretary of State and the lobby interested in the withdrawal of

claims for consequential damages that their clients may be specially paid for direct losses; that the settlement of the point in dispute between the two governments is of great interest to the United States, because it will settle all doubt regarding the liability of this government for the payment of claims arising from injuries done to British subjects during the Fenian raids in Canada.

Indemnity for Injury to a British Ship.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs to-day agreed to report the bill appropriating \$3,500 to indemnify H. Holderness, a British subject, for damage to his schooner, the *Howe*, at Falmouth.

The Morrill Southern Claim Amendment in the Senate—Cole on Sargent's Personality.

The Senate spent nearly all day again to-day upon the amendment to the Deficiency Appropriation bill, offered by Mr. Morrill, which forbids payment to claimants who have heretofore obtained judgment before the Court of Claims. There were several amendments added to Mr. Morrill's proposition, but none that do away with its pernicious or unjust effect. No one believes that the House will resist the action of the Senate in this regard as

that body would have undoubtedly repudiated so unjust a provision had anything like a full vote been had. The vote stood 22 for to 17 against the amendment, only one more than a quorum voting. Mr. Cole undertook to edify the Senate with a personal explanation in relation to an assault made upon him in the House by Mr. Sargent in that gentleman's discussion of the Goat Island bill. In violation of the rules Mr. Sargent used disrespectful language toward Mr. Cole, and, it is asserted, asserted in the *Globe* an extract from a speech of Mr. Cole in the Senate upon the right of actual set-

to that island which he did not use in the debate. The Senate refused, however, to hear Mr. Hoar's grievances until the Goat Island job comes up for a trial. It is reported that the President will take the Goat Island bill if it is passed by the Senate, owing to the fact the republican party in California is hostile to the measure.

Dr. Hoar's Case Before the House for a Whole Day—Banks Defying Dawes.

The case of Dr. Hoar occupied the entire day in the House, and a vote was not reached. The Democrats who spoke to-day took occasion in favoring the resolution to attack the administration. Good, of New York, thought it was clearly proved

Mr. Dr. Howard was a citizen of the United States, and as such entitled to our protection. He criticized the action of the administration in neglecting to take steps to have his wrongs righted, which, he thought, ought to have been done long ago. Mr. F. R. Roberts followed Mr. Wood in an eloquent appeal for a new policy in regard to the protection of American citizenship abroad. In conclusion Colonel Roberts advised

Dr. Howard, in conclusion Colonel Roberts indicated the recognition of Cuban belligerency. He had to deal more with sentiment, but not less with logic, than Mr. Willard, who followed with an argument against the validity of Dr. Howard's claim to protection from the government on the ground of American citizenship. He went on to show that Dr. Howard's father was a Frenchman, who emigrated to Cuba from France. His argument was to the effect that the Doctor was a Cuban by birth, and after receiving his education

on in Philadelphia had returned to that land, where he afterward resided, receiving his medical diploma, and practising his profession for thirty years in that country. He argued that Dr. Howard having performed none of the duties of

Mr. Willard claimed that in adopting the policy proposed we go back on the doctrine of expatriation, to establish which we went to war with England in 1812.

Mr. Bingham said that a declaration was necessary by the laws of Spain for a naturalized citizen in any other country to become a citizen of Spain. He took the ground that Dr. Howard was clearly a citizen of the United States if he had committed no act by which he had forfeited the right of citizenship, and was entitled to protection. He claimed

at the seventh article of the treaty of 1793 had been violated to bring this point forward. At five o'clock General Banks announced his intention to call a previous question, which was the signal for

the previous day, which was the signal for another struggle on the part of the Ways and Means Committee for the floor to-morrow. At this point General Butler asked for ten minutes to be heard in reply to the attacks which had been made on the administration, and proceeded to argue that its course had been consistent, and the resolution proposed by the House was impertinent interference. He addressed himself to the remarks made by Messrs. Wood and Voorhees, characterizing them as unwarrantable, and drew a severe contrast between their zeal for a foreign citi-

and those within their own border, then seeking protection for life and liberty. At the conclusion of General Butler's remarks, Mr. Dawes appealed to the Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs not to allow the debate to go on another day, but to finish it then. He said the house had ordered the Tariff bill to be taken up on

uesday; that he had not been able to get it before the House, and unless to-morrow could be had for that purpose, Tuesday again would

ome before anything was done upon the question of such importance to the people. General Banks replied they could not get the members in the morning and declined to go on with

After a scene on this subject between Mr. Dawes and General Banks, in which Mr. Randall also endeavored to take a hand, the House adjourned. The fight between the two Massachusetts